

Appl. No. 10/715,879
Amdt. dated January 13, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2005

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments

Before this Amendment, claims 1-54 were present for examination. Claims 1, 19, 22, 29, 33, and 37 are amended. Claims 32, 47, 52, and 53 are canceled; and new claims 55-58 are added. Therefore, claims 1-31, 33-46, 48-51, and 54-58 are present for examination, and claims 1, 19, and 37 are the independent claims. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-54 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Application 2004/0213286 A1 to Jette et al. ("Jette").

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection, Jette

The claims have been amended to recite certain embodiments of the invention more particularly. For a valid anticipation rejection, the Office must show that each limitation from the claims appears in a single piece of prior art. The Applicant believes limitations from the amended independent claims are neither taught nor suggested in the Jette reference.

Specifically, 1) claims 1, 19, and 37 are amended to recite that at least a specified minimum amount of bandwidth is allocated to one of the internal interfaces, and 2) claims 1 and 19 are amended to recite that the configuration of the external interface is modified via a control signal initiated remotely by the telecommunications service provider. With these modifications, it is clear that the limitations of the amended claims are *not* disclosed in the cited art.

Allocated Bandwidth: There is no suggestion in Jette that a specified minimum amount of bandwidth available be allocated to one of the internal interfaces, as set forth in amended claims 1, 19, and 37. Support for the amendments can be found in the Specification (Original Application, p. 11, l. 14 - p. 12, l. 24) Support for amended claim 22, and new claims 57 and 58, can be found in this portion of the Specification as well.

Remote Configuration: There is no suggestion in Jette that the external interface comprising a fiber optic connection may be remotely configured by the telecommunication service provider, as set forth in amended claims 1, and 19. Support for the amendments can be

Appl. No. 10/715,879

Amdt. dated January 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2005

PATENT

found in the Specification (*Id.*, p. 15, l. 25 - p. 17, l. 25; p. 21, l. 27 - p. 22, l. 13) Support for new claim 56 can be found in the Specification as well (*Id.*, p. 21, l. 27 - p. 22, l. 13)

Examination of the claims as amended is accordingly requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Drapkin
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
MLD:klb
60847924 v1